
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2021

by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/21/3273332

7 Canford Avenue, Bournemouth BH11 8RU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Davies against the decision of BCP Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2021-4408-F, dated 16 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr and Mrs Davies against BCP Council. This application will be the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 20 July 2021. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy in my decision, planning decisions must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, given the particulars of this case I am satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further comment from the parties on the revised Framework, and that in taking such an approach no party or their cases would be prejudiced.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear extension upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and upon that of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. 7 Canford Avenue (No 7) is a detached bungalow positioned within a mostly residential area. Surrounding No 7 there are a mix of ages and styles of dwellings, several of which are detached. A characteristic of the area is that many of the houses and bungalows are set back from the public highway behind similar sized front gardens.
6. Both No 7 and its neighbour 5 Canford Avenue (No 5) are similar in design and size, with each having modest sized single storey rear extensions. These

bungalows also have complex roofscapes comprising a variety of hipped roofs, side facing dormers, and truncated hips to the rear. They also have driveways that extend along the western boundaries of their plots, leading to single garages.

7. The proposed single storey rear extension would be much larger than the existing conservatory, albeit the western side wall would be set back from that of the bungalow. Nevertheless, the extension would form a large and bulky addition to the bungalow and having regard to the modest dimensions of the host building, the depth of the proposal would be extensive. Given this, the flat roof would appear as a deep and monotonous addition when compared to the complexities of the roof of the host building.
8. The provision of deep eaves that would project well beyond the rear wall of the extension would serve to exaggerate the size of the flat roof. Such a deep projection would appear harmfully discordant when compared to the size of those upon the flank walls of the extension and also with those upon the bungalow. In addition, the heights of the eaves would be noticeably different to those on the bungalow, with the removal of the lower part of the rear hipped roof serving to exaggerate these differences. The overall effect of so many disparities between the bungalow and the extension would be to create numerous clashing, discordant features.
9. Although the appellants consider flat roofs to be a standard treatment, in this case, the extension would fail to reflect the form, style and detailing of the bungalow. Not only would the size of the flat roof appear disproportionately large, but the introduction of this roof form with its lantern light would have little sympathy with the hipped roofs of the host, which are such a prominent feature of this building. Although the walls would be rendered, the extension would form an incongruous juxtaposition to its host, having little integration with the form and style of the existing dwelling.
10. There are other properties nearby with rear extensions, including several with conservatories. Given the positioning of the houses and bungalows on their plots, some of these extensions are visible from the public realm. However, in most cases the extensions have a legible subservience of form and appearance that respects the host building, unlike the scheme before me. The garage and roof canopy over the drive of No 7 would partially obscure views of the extension from this aspect. Notwithstanding this, the extension and its unsympathetic relationship with the bungalow would be apparent from Canford Avenue, particularly due to the open nature and proximity of the extension to the drive of No 5. Whilst I accept views would be restricted, the size, discordant form and relationship the extension would have with the host bungalow would be visible from the public realm, and due to these differences it would harmfully draw the eye.
11. As regards the possibility of implementing permitted development rights to extend the property, it is not the role of an Inspector when dealing with an appeal for planning permission to conduct an exercise as to lawful use and operation in order to decide whether the appellants might be able to rely on permitted development rights as a fallback. From the information provided by the appellants as regards such an alternative, there are a number of differences between this suggestion and the appeal proposal, including the size and height of the extension. In addition, limited evidence has been provided

as to the likelihood of such an extension being carried out. Given this, the weight that I can attribute to any such fallback in this instance is limited.

12. Consequently, the scheme would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host building and that of the area, and this would be contrary to Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012), and guidance in the Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders (2008). These seek amongst other things, well designed and high quality development that respects the site and its surroundings, thereby reflecting objectives of the Framework.

Other Matters

13. Finally, the appellants concerns regarding the Council's handling of the application, are procedural matters that fall to be pursued by other means separate from the appeal process and are not for me to consider.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would fail to accord with the development plan when considered as a whole, and there are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Thus, for the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR